

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,030	07/01/2003	Joseph C. Eder	S63.2-9703-US02	5857
490	7590 04/07/2004	04/07/2004 EXAMINER		INER
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A. 6109 BLUE CIRCLE DRIVE			JACKSON, SUZETTE JAMIE	
SUITE 2000 MINNETONKA, MN 55343-9185			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/612,030	EDER ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jackson J Suzette	3738			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONEE	ely filed will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 Ju	ily 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 32-45 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 32-45 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2003 is/are: a) ☐ Applicant may not request that any objection to the case Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	\square accepted or b) \bowtie objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objective.	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/1/03. 	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e			

Application/Control Number: 10/612,030 Page 2

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "114b" has been used to designate both the "second segment" and "the third segment" in section [0036]. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show "150" as described in the specification in section [0060]. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,030

Page 3

Art Unit: 3738

4. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyle et al. 5,591,198 which discloses the invention as claimed comprising: A coil stent comprising a first loop and a second loop (25, 30, 55), the first and second loop arcing about the longitudinal axis

of the stent, each of the first and second loops having a first end and second end, the stent further

comprising a plurality of expandable links (15) extending between the second end of the first

loop and the first end of the second loop; wherein the expandable link has at least one bend

therein.

5. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gianturco 4,800,882. Gianturco discloses the invention as claimed comprising: a substantially circular ring having at least one expandable link (15, 16) connecting portions of the ring to other portions of the ring the ring having a first end and a second end (18) such that the first end and the second end are longitudinally displaced with one to the other; with at plurality of flexible bends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3738

7. Claims 35-36 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyle et al. and Gianturco. Boyle et al. and Gianturco have both been described above and both disclose the claims but are not specific about 90 and 180 degree spaced links. However it appears it appears that the links of both inventions are approximately 90 to 180 degrees. Applicant has not disclosed that having these specific "degrees" solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose. Moreover, it appears that the links would perform equally well with any spacing disclosed by both Boyle et al. and Gianturco for supporting the blood vessel. Accordingly, the use of 90 or 180 degree spacing is deemed to be a design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Double Patenting

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 32-45 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,585,753. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because

Application/Control Number: 10/612,030

Art Unit: 3738

the new claims merely reword the patented subject matter (see independent claims 1,7, 9 and 15-

Page 5

16) in a broader context.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Berenstein et al. 2003/0195609; Globerman et al. 2001/0041930; Wijay 6,053,940;

Globerman 5,776,161; Das 5,554,181; and Hillstead 4,856,516 all show related material.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Suzette J. Jackson whose work schedule is Monday-Friday 9-6:30

off every other Friday and whose telephone number is 703-308-6516.

12. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned are 703-872-9306.

13. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0858.

Suzette J. Jackson

02 April 2, 2004